

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY
SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL**

FINAL MEETING MINUTES

**Friday, February 9, 2001
8:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Goleta Holiday Inn
Goleta, CA**

In Attendance:

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Alternate Gary Davis

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Member Mark Helvey

US COAST GUARD

Member Lt. Yuri Graves

Alternate Adam Birst

MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE

Member Drew Mayerson

Alternate Fred Piltz, Ph.D.

US NAVY

Alternate Ron Dow

CA DEP'T. OF FISH & GAME

Alternate LT. Jorge Gross

CALIFORNIA RESOURCES AGENCY

Member Brian Baird

Alternate Melissa Miller- Henson

COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

Member Dianne Meester

Alternate Jackie Campbell

COUNTY OF VENTURA

Member Lyn Krieger

Alternate Jack Peveler

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE
SANCTUARY**

LCDR Matthew Pickett, Manager

**MONTEREY BAY NATIONAL MARINE
SANCTUARY**

William Douros, Superintendent

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

TOURISM

Member Jeanette Webber

Alternate Alex Brodie

BUSINESS

Member Rudy Scott

Alternate Dr. Dan Secord

RECREATION

Member Jim Brye

CONSERVATION

Member Linda Krop

Alternate Greg Helms

FISHING

Member Bruce Steele

EDUCATION

Alternate Larry Manson

RESEARCH

Alternate Matthew Cahn

PUBLIC AT-LARGE

Member Marla Daily

Alternate Robert Duncan

PUBLIC AT-LARGE

Member Craig Fusaro, Ph.D.

Alternate Roberta Cordero

Not in attendance:

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVES:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Member Jim Shevock

NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE

Alternate Christina Fahy

US NAVY

Member Alex Stone

CA DEP'T. OF FISH & GAME

Member Patricia Wolf

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

Member Gary Timm

Alternate Jack Ainsworth

COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVES:

RECREATION

Alternate Bill Kendig

EDUCATION

Member Dave Long

PUBLIC AT-LARGE

Member Jon Clark

Alternate Barry Schuyler

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:

**GULF OF THE FARALLONES/CORDELL
BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES**

Ed Ueber, Manager

1. Administrative Items and Announcements

A. Roll Call and Attendance

At the call of the roll, 19 of the 20 voting seats were represented. There were a total of 30 SAC representatives present for the day (13 members, 15 alternates, 2 non-voting representatives). Public attendance at the meeting varied, peaking at approximately 70 individuals.

B. Introductory remarks

SAC Chair Dianne Meester welcomed everyone to the meeting and expressed thanks for so many members of the SAC and the public turning out. Dianne explained that the purpose of the meeting was to receive input from Dan Basta (Director, NOAA Office of National Marine Sanctuaries) about sanctuary boundary alternatives, and to provide him with feedback.

Sanctuary Manager Matt Pickett thanked everyone for showing up and commented that the meeting would be an important opportunity for the Director of the National Marine Sanctuaries System to hear directly from the SAC and the community. Matt expressed that offshore we all enjoy a spectacular collection of marine resources at the Channel Islands, and that we are very fortunate to have this offshore paradise in our backyard. He explained that twenty years ago when the Sanctuary was designated, the issue of setting the boundary was important and controversial. He noted that this is the same today, and expressed hope that through our talks we will make progress toward protecting the resources of the Channel Islands for the next twenty years. Matt noted that the Sanctuary's challenge is to integrate the community's interest with national interests, consistent with the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. He remarked that the Sanctuary takes community input very seriously, and because of this has invited Dan Basta, the Director of the National Marine Sanctuary System, to hear directly from the community and the Advisory Council. Dan Basta, Matt explained, was selected to be the Director of the NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries in January of 2001 and leads the federal program for all

13 National Marine Sanctuaries. Matt added that Dan was trained as an environmental engineer, joined NOAA's National Ocean Service in 1979, and has 25 years of experience in environmental and natural resources management throughout the United States.

C. Meeting minutes

The November 16, 2000 draft meeting minutes were distributed. Dianne Meester asked that comments be sent to Mike Murray by February 28, 2001.

D. New Appointments and Vacant SAC Seats

Dianne Meester commented that the SAC's Executive Committee made recommendations to Matt on the Tourism seat, and in turn Matt has appointed Jeanette Webber.

Jeanette introduced herself, and began by commenting that she has been in the tourism industry in Santa Barbara county for many years and has lived in Santa Barbara since 1956. She explained that she has been in the hospitality industry for the last 30 years, and has been very involved in the promotion of tourism and community environmental concerns. Jeanette added that she feels being involved in the SAC is very important for the future of our community. She remarked that the sanctuary is a wonderful asset, and she is very concerned for its future. She also stated that she looks forward to protecting the environment for local citizens, tourists and visitors, while balancing this with the economic condition of our community. She thanked the SAC for her appointment and commented that she will do her best to help.

Dianne Meester announced that two additional seats are currently open on the SAC: the research seat and the fishing alternate seat. She explained that seats will be open through March 10th, that advertisements and announcements will go out tomorrow, and that applications are available at the back of the room.

E. Member Replacement on Marine Reserves Working Group (MRWG)

Dianne Meester explained that Alicia Stratton, a member of the MRWG, recently stepped down to become an alternate to Shawn Kelly, and that the SAC needs to ratify this membership change. Linda Krop offered a motion that Shawn Kelly be affirmed by the SAC as a member of the MRWG. The motion was seconded. **By unanimous approval, the Advisory Council ratified the appointment of Shawn Kelly to the Marine Reserves Working Group.**

2. Presentation on CINMS Boundary by Dan Basta

Dan Basta, Director of NOAA's Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, provided a 45 minute presentation to the SAC and the public.

Dan began by overviewing what he'd like to talk about, which included the following:

- National Marine Sanctuary System (NMSS) positions, policies and vision with respect to SACs
- Information about the NMSS, including new developments
- CINMS in particular and its special importance

- Background on the management plan review process
- The need for additional input from the SAC and the community regarding refinements to boundary concepts

Dan referred everyone to the handout packet, briefly explaining the enclosed speaking notes he used to prepare for his interview for the Director position.

Concerning the Sanctuary Program's work with Sanctuary Advisory Councils, Dan explained that SACs represent the Program's partnership with America. He explained that the Program is pioneering efforts to support public participation in government. He suggested that Americans want to be more involved up front in decision making and planning; they are no longer willing to put their faith in the hands of institutions that provide answers. Dan stated that the Program has been pioneering this approach since the early 90s, starting with the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS) and the work of their SAC.

Dan pointed out that when the public is concerned and participates directly, the institutions involved have to come to the table. He added that the public has turned out not only to be a partner, but also a powerful force in how we integrate the complex fabrics of institutions. Dan stated that SACs are a key element of this Program, and that the NMSS is looking at ways to enhance and make SACs more effective. He reported that last week in Monterrey the first meeting of SAC Chairpersons was held, and that the purpose was to share common ideas about how SACs work, how issues are being dealt with, how to involve the community, and even how to run meetings. Dan expressed that the Program wants to help empower SACs, and will continue to have annual meetings of the Chairs. Addressing the Council, he stated that the SAC is empowered, and that this is real. He went on to add that the Program is not looking for SACs to rubberstamp sanctuary actions.

Dan remarked that it is very important that SACs find ways to become effective articulators of their constituents. He stated that the Program works to help the public get organized. NOAA and the NMSS are committed to SACs, Dan said, and needs your help with this.

Dan reported that the Program has done remarkably well over the past three years with respect to the budget process. This year the operating budget is \$32 million, which he said is actually not very much when you consider how much programs cost and what we spend in this country. He also said that another little increase is expected next year, and that he thought the Program's assets would continue to gradually increase. The key challenge, Dan stated, is how to make the best use of those assets. We need guidance from communities and the sites about priorities, and we need to be sure that we are providing the key assets to key places. Dan commented that a good example is the loss of the *Ballena* (the CINMS research vessel). He reported that the Program is in the process of engaging in the construction of a new vessel, and to that has provided CINMS with \$600K. He said that he expects that with 12 months there will be a new top of the line vessel here in Santa Barbara to fulfill the research and other obligations that the community has come to depend on from the Program.

Dan suggested that if the NMSS is to go "prime-time" in providing stewardship to the nation and leading the marine conservation community, additional assets will be needed. He announced that the National Marine Sanctuary Foundation has recently been created, and explained that its sole purpose is acquiring assets for the national marine sanctuaries of the United States. Dan

announced that on March 27, there will be a reception for the Foundation, with an invitee list is over 600. The point, Dan said, is that this provides a means to access the kinds of resources that the Program needs for certain types of assets, such as visitors centers and enhanced education programs. Dan also explained that the National Foundation will work closely with local foundations, and will hopefully be able to help with their funding. Dan expressed that this should be a message to everyone that there are interests in this country that will take it upon themselves to finance public programs that they believe are important for the national interest. Dan said that he is very encouraged and looks forward to seeing great things from the Foundation, and expects that in the next two years the community will see benefits here.

Dan stated that the CINMS, at this specific point in time, is a particularly important place. Dan asked if we, in the richest, most educated country containing the highest level of technology, can't find a way to find the accommodation and compromise to sustain local marine economies and the ecosystems on which they depend, then is there any reason for others to think that they can do this. The answer, he suggested, is no. He added that to some extent, we have a global and national responsibility here.

Dan suggested that the goal we are all looking to meet is to sustain marine economies and ecosystems. He noted, however, that it is not easy to find examples in this country of places where this has been done well. One example that Dan cited and explained was the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary and the SAC's involvement in helping to reach agreements and compromises that guided the development of the site's management plan.

At CINMS, Dan said, the process the community has been going through in the management plan revision process is unique in its efforts to bring the public's knowledge, values, and perceptions into a federal process. It's not easy, and it's messy, Dan stated. Dan suggested that the issue is really not whether the NMSS can figure it out, but whether you (the community) can figure it out. He added that this is where the balance gets struck to reach a shared goal of sustaining local marine economies and ecosystems. The Program, he said, can create the forum for this, facilitate it, and implement policies to help make it happen, but it has to be created by the community. Dan stated that if the community can't find the compromise, then it is unlikely that the Program can either.

Dan commented that the CINMS management plan revision process presents a community challenge to get ahead of any recognized crisis; to be proactive in preventing a future crisis. Dan also noted that others are watching this process closely, and will likely mimic it. He characterized the CINMS management plan revision process as an opportunity for the Sanctuary to be reborn. He also noted that management itself is a continuous process, and that a good management plan should serve as a blue print for addressing issues as they arise and as you can deal with them.

Dan complimented the SAC on their hard work and a good job done to help CINMS with the management plan process. He clarified for the SAC what the NMSS objectives are at all sites: to sustain local marine economies and to sustain local marine ecosystems.

Dan commented on the importance and challenge of addressing integrated coastal management problems associated with the land/sea interface. He stated that the NMSS interest in a possible

CINMS boundary expansion is that, where practical and possible, it be co-terminous with the mainland coast in order to address integrated coastal management problems.

Dan shared with the SAC some main points contributed by the NMSS Leadership Team concerning the expansion of boundaries at CINMS. These included suggestions that oil & gas lease blocks be avoided, that incompatible uses such as oil & gas development should be avoided, and that lease block areas should be considered for annexation to the CINMS in time as those industrial operations expire.

Reviewing a handout provided to the SAC and everyone in the audience, Dan explained a new Boundary Concept map “2A.” Dan stepped the Council through handouts that presented a comparative analysis of Boundary Concepts 1, 2, 2A, 3, 4, 5 and Status Quo. Dan described some of the physical and ecological criteria that had been evaluated, such as “percentage of undeveloped mainland coastline” and “areas of significant upwelling.” Dan also noted that human activities throughout the management plan study area were reviewed and compared for each Boundary Concept, including “number of harbors,” “producing federal oil and gas leases” and “number of active oil and gas support facilities.”

Dan explained the “donut holes” on the Boundary Concept map 2A as avoiding oil and gas lease blocks. Dan explained the logic behind the NMSS preference to exclude oil and gas leases, emphasizing the desire to avoid incompatible uses within CINMS and noting that leased areas could be annexed to the Sanctuary in time.

In wrapping up his presentation, Dan reminded the SAC of the importance of succeeding at CINMS, for the community and national interests. Dan said that at this time the expected release schedule for the CINMS management plan DEIS was within about 90 days. Dan noted again the importance that the agency’s preferred alternative be well connected with the interests of the community, as opposed to running counter.

3. Council Discussion

In response to questions and concerns raised by Brian Baird about the reasoning for a boundary expansion, Dan Basta responded by noting three select points: 1) A sanctuary boundary to the mainland will help connect people to the coast; 2) boundary expansion enables us to really work to manage the ecosystem, by, for example, expanding and targeting research and other programs; 3) a larger sanctuary boundary will provide the community a larger marine area in which to take ownership and action. Brian Baird followed up by stating that he hopes to see in the DEIS a strong plan for expanding monitoring and research in any larger Sanctuary area.

Lyn Krieger commented that she hopes that Ventura is not forgotten about in all of these plans, noting that this is not just a Santa Barbara project. Lyn pointed out what seemed to be a bit of a disconnect in this process, noting that SAC members are only “advisors” but Dan had commented that the Council is the “builder” of the management plan. She expressed that laying the responsibility of building the management plan on the SAC is unfair. Lyn also commented that it seems like there is already an answer here, but the SAC is not being told what it is.

Jim Brye said that he has done a lot of outreach with yacht club associations. He commented that he has heard universal support for the Sanctuary program, but has never heard a constituent say that CINMS ought to be larger.

Dan Basta commented that there are ways for a SAC to be more proactive than just reviewing and commenting on draft plans. The success of a SAC, he suggested, is in the “gray area,” when members step up and find ways to be more participative than reactive.

Linda Krop introduced herself, noting that she is the Chair of the SAC’s Conservation Working Group. The Conservation Working Group, Linda reported, has studied very closely all of the boundary concepts, and strongly recommends Concept 1. Linda explained that Concept 1 is really the only option that meets the objectives Dan had laid out. Linda pointed out that Concept 1 meets 100% of the “ecosystem inclusivity” criteria (while option 2A meets only 57%), Concept 1 meets 100% of the “public connection with the coast” criteria (compared to 50% for option 2A), and Concept 1 ranks highest with regard to providing enhanced educational opportunities. Linda stated that a mainland coastal connection to CINMS is very important, noting that we don’t enjoy the community support and involvement that exists at the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary (which connects to the coast). Concept 2A, Linda noted, does not connect to the coast where the people are. Long term protection, Linda said, requires dealing with oil and gas, and Concept 1 does this best.

Ron Dow stated that looking at boundaries without reference to regulations is difficult. Ron asked Dan Basta if Concept 2A was a preferred alternative. Dan said no, that it is not, that it’s merely “cannon fodder” at this time. Ron added that the Navy’s Sea Range area and activities are critical, and that with any CINMS expansion the ability to continue conducting Sea Range operations would be needed. Ron also suggested that the one of the units of measure used to compare each boundary concept should be changed, specifically noting that “percentage included in sea range” should be changed to “square miles included in sea range.”

Bruce Steele introduced himself by describing the extensive time he has spent diving in the region, and abroad. Of all the places he’s been, Bruce said, the Channel Islands are by far the most important, and the reason he, and everyone else, is here. Bruce commented that originally the Sanctuary idea was sold to fishermen as a means to protect the Channel Islands from oil, and not as a way to protect the islands from fishing. Bruce stated that he is not an enemy of oil. Bruce expressed concern about Concept 2A, pointing out that it would exempt oil and sewer outfalls (containing tons of zinc and copper). The islands are remote and wild, Bruce said, and that’s the way they should remain. If the CINMS boundary extended to the coast, Bruce said, then agricultural interests will get upset, as well as fishermen. Bruce described the boundary expansion idea as “going after the weakest link,” and noted that he did not think CINMS would be doing anything about shipping or air pollution. For those of us that have taken good care of the resources, Bruce asked, what’s the reward? Bruce wondered if marine reserves would expand throughout the enlarged area. According to Bruce, this is what fishermen fear. Bruce emphasized that the Sanctuary’s focus should remain on the islands, and should not be concerned with the public relations opportunities provided by going to the coast. Bruce stated that the Sanctuary is a wilderness area, and that NOAA should not divert attention away from the islands. He also said that staff at the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary spend something like 70-80% of their time working on coastal issues, and that he does not want to see this happen here.

Drew Mayerson reminded everyone that ecosystem of the Santa Barbara includes oil and gas, including a very large natural seep. Drew said that extraction of oil and gas, if managed properly, can be compatible with the Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary.

Larry Manson, as an educator and teacher, said that he and many of his colleagues in education tend to look at where things are headed over the next 10 to 20 years. It's important to encourage economic activity, Larry stated, but also to balance that with protection of the ecosystem. Larry reminded everyone that the Sanctuary provides a very important educational opportunity. Visibility of the sanctuary is important, Larry said, and expansion of the Sanctuary would help increase visibility.

Jeanette Webber acknowledged that this issue presents a significant struggle, but that the struggle itself is not necessarily a bad thing. The tourism industry, she said, understands well that a quality environment draws visitors to the area. Jeanette stated that she is in favor of going forward, despite the struggles involved.

Marla Daily introduced herself and noted that she knows the Channel Islands very well, has lived on them, and has authored several books about the islands. She reminded everyone that the name of the Sanctuary is Channel Islands. She emphasized the importance of staying focused on the islands, and cautioned against diverting resources elsewhere.

Roberta Cordero asked how we can keep a focus on who the community is. Roberta suggested that the community is not just humans. When the Europeans came to this area, she noted, the place was wild and pristine. Roberta added that our relationship with the ecosystem does not change just because we don't acknowledge it. Roberta commented that a land/sea connection to the Sanctuary will make us acknowledge our connection and relationship. She also commented that she is one of the folks who can't easily go out to the islands to visit the Sanctuary, and so having the sanctuary close to the coast would help people like herself to visit and appreciate it.

Robert Duncan asked what happened to boundary option 5A, which he recalled receiving a slight majority vote from the SAC about six months ago. Matt Pickett responded that the SAC actually provided him with a split recommendation to consider Concepts 2 and 5A, rather than a majority vote in favor of just one option. Dan Basta added that he knows all about the SAC's history on this issue, and that he has heard all of the SAC's concerns from the staff. Dan said that he, too, was concerned and that's why he came out to hear directly from the SAC and the community.

Craig Fusaro commented that an understanding of applicable regulations is necessary in order to make sense of boundary options. Craig suggested that a focus be kept on the islands, rather than being lost to the wide variety of issues that are on the table. He suggested that "ecosystems" are a social convention, and variable. And "ecosystem approach," Craig offered, would really need to consider the entire southern California Bight. Craig pointed out that while there have been many declines in the ecosystem, there have also been many increases too, such as blue whales, Orcas, gray whales and California sea lions. Craig said that he has concerns about the staff's ability to manage an area three to four times larger than the current Sanctuary, and suggested that a staff of 30-40 might be needed in order to do the job in the future. Craig commented that Concept 2A misses important ecosystem processes, such as watershed connections and the effects of rivers like the Santa Clara. Craig suggested that if an ecosystem approach is really to be used, then all of it should be considered. Craig also pointed out that right now there is a lot of

funding available to do watershed work, but CINMS has not had the staff to be part of these efforts.

4. Public Comment Period

The public comment period provided 35 speakers with the opportunity to speak for two minutes each. The speakers and a summary of their positions follow:

- Carla Frisk, for CA State Senator Jack O’Connell. (distributed letter to SAC; keep leases in the sanctuary or else assure that leased areas will be immediately annexed to CINMS upon termination, prior to being released; keep long term view in mind; set boundaries consistent with the National Marine Sanctuaries Act)
- Jenna Garmon (in support of Concept 1; do not view oil and gas issues as a barrier to extend to the coast; many people support an expanded sanctuary)
- Phillip Tseng (in support of largest possible Sanctuary; must provide adequate space for species to thrive)
- Bud Laurent (in support of Concept 1; rules and regulations will evolve appropriately over time; include all of Santa Lucia Bank)
- Eric Cardenas (in support of Concept 1; 2A is a compromise that gives the oil industry what they want; please act to regulate oil)
- Diane Conn, Get Oil Out (in support of Concept 1; we need better regional management; we need coordinated help protecting the SB channel from oil)
- Jesse Swanhieser (in support of Concept 1; concept 1 best meets the sanctuary’s mandate; this is a rare opportunity to do the right thing)
- Frank Holmes, Western States Petroleum Association (importance that Oil industry have a seat on SAC; consider boundary impacts on boat, pipelines, etc., not just lease blocks)
- Harry Liquornik, Commercial Fishermen of Santa Barbara, Inc. (expanding boundaries would be a big mistake given importance of support by fishing community for marine reserves process)
- Arianna Katovick, USCB Environmental Affairs Board and Citizens for Goleta Valley (in support of Concept 1; with 2A, the scales seem unbalanced with respect to interests)
- Courtney Estes (in support of Concept 1; 2A asks everyone to compromise except the oil industry)
- Ada Otter (in support of Concept 1; concept 1 is the most valid ecologically)
- Steve Shimek, Executive Director, The Otter Project (2A donut holes would provide “special abuse areas” that set a bad precedent for sanctuaries; would be more in favor of smaller sanctuary with “bigger teeth.”)
- Sierra Hill, UCSB Environmental Affairs Board (in support of Concept 1; do everything possible to protect the sanctuary from oil)
- Mike Lunsford, Gaviota Coast Conservancy (in support of Concept 1 for ecological connectivity; SAC and CINMS should be courageous and act now proactively protect all of the SB channel)
- Craig Revell, Isla Vista Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation (in support of Concept 1; urban coast is important part of the ecosystem, and so are oil lease areas)
- Jean Holmes, League of Women Voters. (in support of Concept 1; favor inclusion of oil leases; act now to expand boundaries, while the opportunity exists)

- Kate Wing, National Resources Defense Council (difficult to comment without the details on regulations; want to see more in the DEIS; strive to make sanctuaries “real.”)
- Brian MacDonald (in support of Concept 1; concerned about resource declines, degradation of the pristine environment and oil impacts)
- Chuck Janisse, Federation of Independent Seafood Harvesters (serious concern about the integrity and credibility of the public process, noting NOAA has control of it)
- Michael McGinnis, Author of CINMS management plan study area recommendation report and member of Marine Reserves Working Group (distributed a letter to the SAC; sanctuary has been fake; importance of focusing on current sanctuary with scientifically-based system of no-take marine reserves)
- Mike Summers, Conception Coast Project (in support of Concept 1)
- Bruce Trowbridge (concerned about the MRWG process and the 30-50% closure recommendation by the Science Panel)
- Steve Greig, Venoco. (need clarification on the 2A map boundaries, need to know the proposed regulations, would like to have representation on the SAC)
- Jim Bray, Nuevo Energy Co. (commended NOAA for focusing protection on the islands, wants to see more detail in the DEIS)
- Sandy Delano, Ventura Harbor. (expanded boundary would have higher costs than benefits; in support of Concept 5A, which would have been supported by a majority of the SAC if another round of voting had taken place)
- Oscar Pena, Ventura Port District (not sure why Concept 1 is still being considered when many on the SAC have recommended option 5A)
- Jim Ruch (be rigorous in planning process, including detailed look at costs associated with expanding)
- Chris Miller, Commercial fisherman and member of Marine Reserves Working Group. (marine reserves process is being sabotaged by the boundary expansion issue; CINMS has too much going on at one time, should focus on marine reserves)
- Sandra Squires. (in support of boundary that will capture as much of ecosystem as possible; concerned about the shooting of marine mammals)
- George Steinbach, Chevron, Inc. (supports the NMSS; important to protect the islands; support the public process; would like to get involved and contribute)
- David Wass. (the real problem is overpopulation and the overpollution, overfishing and overproducing we bring; “sanctify” as much of the resources out there as possible)
- Carolyn Moffatt, Port San Luis Harbor District. (excluding oil leases brings serious risk of impacts; please evaluate the importance of all of Santa Lucia bank and consider its inclusion)
- Nancy Berenson. (in support of Concept 1; suggested criteria argues most clearly for Concept 1; need clarification on regulations; important to address watershed problems)
- Rick Skillin, Sierra Club. (in support of maximum boundary possible; recognize importance of the land/sea connection)

5. Council Discussion, Continued

Greg Helms agreed with many of the commenters that the islands are most important. Greg added that the ecosystem is much larger than the islands, and so are the threats. He echoed others by saying that he would like to see the latest version of the draft regulations. Greg stated that the analysis of Boundary Concepts had been done appropriately. He also said that to his knowledge 95% of the public comments received concerning boundaries had been in favor of

expansion. Greg said that he is very interested in water quality, and wants to see CINMS become an effective partner in issues such as oil and gas development and non-point source pollution problems. To this end, Greg said, it helps to extend the sanctuary boundary to the coast. Greg expressed that Concept 2A seems to suggest that big industry would be off the hook.

Brian Baird asked if management was really the focus here. He expressed that he would not want to see a larger area for the sake of expansion, and without real management. Brian said that in the management plan he would like to see a discussion on how well current objectives are being met, how future objectives will be met, and how adequate resources are to achieve those objectives. He emphasized that it is very important to be clear on what is attempting to be achieved. Brian suggested that resource availability should be considered very seriously, noting that CINMS just lost a research vessel and that CDFG has very few on-water resources as well. He also stated that the Governor's office will be asking what we're trying to achieve here.

Larry Manson suggested that the question of whether or not the sanctuary is worth expanding should come first, and then a look at the resources necessary to do so should follow. The resources to do the job are never there in the beginning, Larry said.

Linda Krop agreed with Larry, stating that it should first be decided what's important to do, and then figure out how. She suggested that the needed resources don't all have to come from the Sanctuary, and noted the local Project Clean Water as a model example of what's possible. Linda stated that if resources are not included within the boundaries of the Sanctuary, then actions to protect them will not happen.

Lyn Krieger pointed out that this is a 5 year management plan, and as such whatever is done now can be changed in five years. She emphasized that the real risk here is in doing a "big nothing."

6. Closing Remarks by Dan Basta and Matt Pickett

Dan Basta encouraged the SAC to send additional comments about the boundary issue to CINMS by March 1st. Dan emphasized that the agency wants to get this right, even if the management plan schedule needs to be adjusted.

Dan pointed out that CINMS staff and the SAC could have limited their thinking to a status quo boundary, but instead have provided a valuable community forum to consider broader issues. He also noted that the NMSS recognizes that it does not need to regulate everything, and that there is value in serving as a forum where complex issues can be discussed.

Dan commented that he heard today many valid economic concerns associated with this issue, a common concern for the long term protection of the environment, and wide agreement on goals to sustain local marine economies and ecosystems. He reminded everyone that the community plays a powerful role in the process. If parties feel left out of the process, Dan said, we will work to address that.

Dan explained that the management plan process ends up in a proposal on the desk of the Secretary of Commerce. A united and consistent message containing appropriate compromises, Dan said, will carry the day, while a proposal that is overly divisive will not succeed. Dan closed

by acknowledging that the CINMS staff has worked hard on this, and has worked hard to support the SAC. The NMSS, Dan said, will do even more to support the SAC and this process.

Sanctuary Manager Matt Pickett remarked that he was very impressed with the public's comments and heartened by the common thread of love for the Channel Islands. Matt explained that today was about letting the SAC and the public be heard on this issue. He added that while it will not be possible for a boundary decision to please everyone, the local staff and the NMSS have listened carefully and thoroughly to everyone.

Matt explained that a decision on the boundary has been bumped up a level within the agency (NOAA). Matt said he hopes to see a preferred boundary alternative identified by early March, and if so will announce it at the March 14 SAC meeting. He explained further that release of the DEIS will follow, and with that the agency would be responding to all public comments received.

7. Future Meeting Dates

In addition to regular updates on the marine reserves and management plan processes, the following was mentioned as future meeting agenda items:

- March 14: 30 min. Presentation by REEF (Reef Environmental Education Foundation)
- March 14: Presentation by staff on CINMS programs (research, education, resource protection, etc.)

The SAC meeting schedule is as follows:

- March 14 – SAC meeting, Ventura
- May 23 – SAC meeting (to receive MRWG recommendation)
- June 19 – SAC meeting (to act on MRWG recommendation)
- July 11 – SAC meeting
- Sept. 12 – SAC meeting
- Nov. 14 – SAC meeting

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Meeting summary respectfully submitted by:

Michael Murray
Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary